DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 995 TM 004 117

AUTHOR Hecht, Alfred R.
TITLE Evaluating Committee and Individual Conference Roles of Educational Leaders.
PUB DATE [74]
NOTE 17p.; For related documents, see TM 004 118 and 119

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Administrator Role; *Behavior Rating Scales; *Committees; *Conferences; Factor Analysis; Test Reliability
IDENTIFIERS Committee Role Rating Scale; Conference Role Semantic Differential

ABSTRACT

This study described the initial development of a Committee Role Rating Scale (CRRS) and a Conference Role Semantic Differential (CRSD) as measures of these specific roles common to administrators at all educational levels. Although the CRRS showed general construct validity, the small amount of common variance accounted for by the factors and the low internal consistency reliability of the initial form of CRRS indicate a need for further development before nonresearch use. Because it is further developed than the CRRS, the CRSD showed greater construct validity, and a factor structure which accounts for more common variance. In addition, the CRSD has an acceptable internal consistency reliability of .86 and the general stability of its factors over time has been demonstrated. However, the internal consistency reliability of the factors should be increased by adding related scales to permit diagnostic use of factor scores. Scale substitutions or modifications should be made, also, to further increase the independence of the factors before this instrument is used widely. (Author/SM)

ED100995

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Evaluating Committee and Individual Conference Roles of Educational Leaders

by
Alfred R. Hecht
Moraine Valley Community College
Palos Hills, Illinois

A growing concern for administrator evaluation has accompanied the educational accountability movement. On the basis of a review of the ERIC literature on evaluation, Poliakoff (1973) reported that "by 1968 a growing trend to evaluate school administrators was evident."

Although writers such as Barraclough (1973), McCleary (1973) and Melton (1970) cite the need for development of a variety of measures of increasingly complex administrative roles at all levels of education, according to Barraclough (1973) and Scriven (1974), procedures for evaluating administrative performance are underdeveloped.

In this pilot study, a Committee Role Rating Scale (CRRS) and a Conference Role Semantic Differential (CRSD) were developed and field tested as brief diagnostic measures of these educational leadership roles.

Review of Literature

The need for valid and reliable, diagnostic measures of administrator performance was cited by Castetter and Heisler (1971), Rosenberg (1971), and by Wochner and Lynch (1973).

In contrast to the multitude of studies on technical characteristics of faculty performance measures, studies of administrative evaluation lack such characteristics. Instead, they focus on identification of personnel evaluated, frequency of evaluation, evaluation forms or instruments, notification of results and appeal procedures. Stemnock, for example, has reported four studies of administrative performance for the Educational Research Service. Her 1968 study included the formalized evaluation procedures of 62 school systems.

TM 004 117

Her 1970 report presented the "client-oriented" evaluation procedures of 29 school systems. In 1971, Stemnock's report included evaluation forms of 11 school systems. These forms were intended to stimulate the thinking of individuals involved in developing procedures for evaluating administrators. In her 1973 report, she summarizes the client-centered-evaluation procedures of 469 school systems. This report includes 10 administrator evaluation forms. In 1973, Napa College described its procedures for evaluating college administrators. However, none of these studies included data on the technical characteristics of any of the instruments presented.

Because of its ability to measure complex concepts by means of a simple format, the semantic differential has been used widely in educational research. In studies of teacher effectiveness, the semantic differential has been shown to possess desirable technical characteristics. For example, Gulo (1972) compared the results of four studies in which the semantic differential was used to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of college professors. He concluded:

- some teacher effectiveness factors are stable across time and populations
- the proportion of variance accounted for by each factor varies across populations and from one factor analysis to another
- the semantic differential seems to be an especially useful technique for quantifying emergent variables associated with student perceptions of teaching effectiveness and effective professors.

In addition to its use in faculty evaluation, the semantic differential has been used in administrator evaluation.

Although no data on its technical characteristics are given, Stemnock's 1970 report included a semantic differential which has been used to evaluate

principals in Cheyenne, Wyoming. This instrument, which consisted of 18 adjective and verb-phrase pairs, provides a global assessment of the principal's role.

Procedures

A Committee Role Rating Scale (CRRS) (Figure 1) was designed to sample task, group maintenance and self-serving functions in committee meetings. On the basis of these functional dimensions of leadership described by Lassey (1971, pp. 5-7), four statements were developed which represented behaviors characteristic of each function. To simplify diagnostic scoring, items were listed by function. A five-choice response scale ranging "always" to "never" was employed to record frequency of occurrence of each behavior.

In addition to the 12 objective items, the CRRS included two free-response items which asked evaluators to identify strengths and weaknesses in the committee functions performed by the person being evaluated.

Insert Figure 1 about here

CRRS was completed anonymously by each member of each committee on which three institutional research staff members served. Responses from all 23 respondents were pooled in a factor analysis to assess the construct validity of the three hypothesized factors.

On the basis of the factor analysis, factor scores were calculated by summing across the weighted responses for the statements comprising each factor. For each factor and for the entire scale, internal consistency reliability was determined according to Cronbach's Alpha.

Prompted by the semantic differential used for teacher evaluation of principals in Cheyenne, Wyoming (Stemnock, 1970, p. 42), a Conference Role Semantic Differential (CRSD) (Figure 2) was designed to sample task and

interpersonal functions of educational leaders in individual conferences. Seven bi-polar adjective pairs were selected to represent each function. Four adjective-scales were drawn from the Cheyenne instrument. The remainder were drawn or adapted from Osgood (1957, pp. 53-61) using his criteria for scale selection (pp. 78-80). Item order and adjective polarity were randomized to minimize response bias. A seven interval response scale was used.

Insert Figure 2 about here

In addition to the 14 adjective-scales, the CRSD included two free-response items which asked evaluators to identify strengths and weaknesses in the conference roles performed by the person being evaluated. An unsigned draft CRSD was completed by 52 staff members. In the judgment of three institutional research staff members each evaluator had sufficient conference experience to quality him for the task. As with CRRS, responses from all 52 individuals were pooled for factor analysis of construct validity.

Factor scores and their internal consistency reliability were determined in the same manner as CRRS. In addition, factor stability was determined by applying Veldman's (1967, pp. 242-244) "relate procedure" to the 1972 and 1973 CRSD factor loadings.

All statistical calculations were performed by an IBM 370 computer using programs TESTAT, FACTOR and RELATE (Veldman, 1967, pp. 174-180, 222-236 and 242-244).

A revised CRSD (Figure 3) was administered one year after the draft scale.

Insert Figure 3 about here

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Results

As shown in Table 1, for the CRRS, principal components analysis with varimax rotation to simple structure yielded Group Maintenance, Self-Serving and Task Factors which accounted for 50 per cent of the total common variance.

Insert Table 1 about here

However, the items didn't cluster exactly as hypothesized in scale construction. Two intended "task" items joined the "group maintenance" factor and three items appeared on no factor because there was no variance in responses. Further testing on a larger sample should establish whether lack of variance is attributable to the nature of these scale items or to the performance of those being evaluated.

As shown in the following table, internal consistency reliability coefficients for the CRRS ranged from .45 to .75 with the factor consisting of the largest number of items having the largest alpha.

Internal Consistency Reliability of CRRS

Factor	Number of Items	Coefficient Alpha
Group Maintenance	5	.75
Self-Serving	2	.54
Task	2	.45
CRRS	9	.57

N = 23

As shown in Table 2, for the draft CRSD, principal components analysis with varimax rotation to simple structure yielded four factors--one task, two interpersonal and one task and interpersonal.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Insert Table 2 about here

In an effort to obtain clearer factors, CRSD was revised by omitting an adjective-scale which loaded almost equally on two factors and by adding three adjective-scales intended to help define three factors. As shown in Table 3 principal components analysis of varimax rotation to simple structure for the revised CRSD yielded one task and three interpersonal factors which accounted for 70 per cent of the variance. The loadings suggested these factor descriptions: Problem-Solving, Tact in Personal Contacts, Accepting Others' Views and Persuasive. These factors are similar to several established by Brown (1967) in his study of job analysis by multidimensional scaling.

Insert Table 3 about here

Although these factors were clearer than those obtained with the draft CRSD, shifts in factor location for some scales indicate a need for further validation on a larger sample.

Internal consistency reliability of CRSD factors ranged from .39 to .91 with the factor comprised of the largest number of items having the largest coefficient. The revised CRSD instrument had an alpha of .86 as shown in the following table.

Internal Consistency Reliability of CRSD

Factor	Number of Items	Coefficient Alpha
Tact in Personal Contacts	7	.91
Accepting Others' Views	4	.64
Persuasive	2	.63
Problem-Solving	2	.39
CRSD	15	.86

N = 52

Factor stability from 1972 to 1973 was established by applying Veldman's (1967) "relate procedure" to maximize the fit between 1972 and 1973 factor solutions. The cosines of the angles between the factors produced in the "relate procedure" are shown in the following table. These cosines can be interpreted in the same way as correlation coefficients between factors.

Stability of CRSD Factors

1972 Factors	1973 Factors			
	1	2	3	4
1	.868	-.221	-.438	.149
2	.118	-.299	.625	.712
3	.496	.534	.579	-.366
4	-.053	.760	-.288	.580

Factor 1 in the 1972 solution is substantially correlated with Factor 1 in the 1973 solution, and these factors are comparatively uncorrelated with the other three factors.

Factors 2 and 4 in these solutions are interchangeable.

Although the third factor in the 1972 solution is related to the third factor in the 1973 solution, the third factor of the 1972 solution is also related to the second factor and somewhat to the first factor of the 1973 solution.

These results indicate a substantial stability of CRSD factors from 1972 to 1973.

The adjective-scale vector correlations shown in Table 4 indicate that the differences in "meaning" of the factors derived in the two analyses are attributable largely to the adjective-scales "Approachable-Unapproachable," "Accurate-Careless" and "Pleasant-Annoying" all of which changed factor locations from one solution to the other.

Insert Table 4 about here

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Summary

This pilot study has described the initial development of a Committee Role Rating Scale (CRRS) and a Conference Role Semantic Differential (CRSD) as measures of these specific roles common to administrators at all educational levels.

Although the CRRS showed general construct validity, the small amount of common variance accounted for by the factors and the low internal consistency reliability of the initial form of CRRS indicate a need for further development before non-research use.

Because it is further developed than the CRRS, the CRSD shows greater construct validity, and a factor structure which accounts for more common variance. In addition, the CRSD has an acceptable internal consistency reliability of .86 and the general stability of its factors over time has been demonstrated. However, the internal consistency reliability of the factors should be increased by adding related scales to permit diagnostic use of factor scores. Scale substitutions or modifications should be made, also, to further increase the independence of the factors before this instrument is used widely.

Other limitations of these instruments also reflect their developmental stage. These include:

- Use of only three community college institutional researchers as the sample evaluated.
- Use of only 23-52 community college staff members as evaluators.
- Lack of norms for interpretation of relative performance.

In spite of these present limitations, refined versions of these instruments should be helpful in staff development, contract renewal and salary determination. Because of the universality of the specific educational roles assessed by these instruments, they should be applicable to all levels of administrators at all levels of education.

References

Barraclough, Terry. Administrator Evaluation, Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1973.

Brown, Kenneth R. "Job Analysis by Multidimensional Scaling," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 51, No. 6, pp. 469-475, 1967.

Castetter, William B. and Heister, Richard S. Appraising and Improving the Performance of School Administrative Personnel, Philadelphia: Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 1971. (ED 060 540)

Gulo, E. Vaughn. Measuring Dimensions of Teaching Effectiveness with the Semantic Differential, 1972. (ED 064 346)

Lassey, William R. "Dimensions of Leadership," Leadership and Social Change, by University Association, Associates Publishers and Consultants, Iowa City, Iowa, 1971.

McCleary, Lloyd E. Competency Based Educational Administration and Applications to Related Fields, January, 1973. (ED 077 136)

Melton, George E. and others. The Principalship: Job Specifications and Salary Considerations for the '70's, Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970. (ED 040 492)

Napa College. Evaluation of Administrators and Practices for Evaluating Administrators, Napa, California: Napa College, 1973. (ED 081 414)

Osgood, Charles E.; Suci, George J. and Tannenbaum, Percy H. The Measurement of Meaning, University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Poliakoff, Lorraine. Evaluating School Personnel Today, Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1973. (ED 073 045)

Rosenberg, Max. "The Values of School Principal Evaluation," Education, 91, 3, pp. 212-214, 1971.

Scriven, Michael. Oral presentation included in Evaluation Pre-session of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 14-15, 1974.

Stemnock, Suzanne K. Evaluating Administrative Performance, Educational Research Service Circular Number 7, American Association of School Administrators: Washington, D.C., 1968. (ED 032 635)

Stemnock, Suzanne K. The Evaluatee Evaluates the Evaluator, Educational Research Service, Circular Number 5, American Association of School Administrators: Washington, D.C., 1970. (ED 044 378)

Stemnock, Suzanne K. Evaluating Administrative/Supervisory Performance, Educational Research Service, Circular Number 6, American Association of School Administrators: Washington, D.C., 1971. (ED 058 155)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Stemnock, Suzanne K. Evaluating the Evaluator, Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service, 1973. (ED 081 114)

Veldman, Donald J. Fortran Programming for the Behavioral Sciences, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Wochner, Raymond E. and Lynch, Steven B. The Identification and Development of Administrative Competencies, Tempe, Arizona: Arizona State University, 1973.

ED100996

FIGURE 1. Committee Role Rating Scale

Committee Member Evaluation of _____

Activities on 1972-73 _____ committee.

I. Before each activity, circle the letter which represents your rating of this committee member. Use this key:

A = Always
B = Usually
C = Sometimes
D = Seldom
E = Never
Blank = Not Observed

A B C D E 1. Contributions were clearly stated.

A B C D E 2. Was well prepared for committee meetings.

A B C D E 3. Introduced information or ideas which contributed to committee decisions.

A B C D E 4. Pulled together related ideas discussed by the group.

A B C D E 5. Promoted good personal feelings among committee members.

A B C D E 6. Encouraged others to contribute to the discussion.

A B C D E 7. Listened well to contributions of others.

A B C D E 8. Was courteous to and respectful of others.

A B C D E 9. Criticized or blamed others; deflated the ego or status of others.

A B C D E 10. Attempted to call attention to himself by loud or excessive talking.

A B C D E 11. Interfered with group progress by going off on a tangent, arguing too much on a point or rejecting ideas without consideration.

A B C D E 12. Introduced or supported suggestions related to his own pet concerns or philosophies.

II. What contributes most to this staff members' effectiveness as a committee member?

III. In what ways could this staff member increase his effectiveness as a committee member?

.. BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED100697

FIGURE 2. Conference Role Semantic Differential (Draft)

STAFF EVALUATION OF _____

PART I. Directions: Place an "X" on each line below, at the point which represents your judgment of this staff member.

	Very	Quite	Slightly	No Opinion	Slightly	Quite	Very	
unapproachable								approachable
annoying								pleasant
approving								faultfinding
attentive								inattentive
closed-minded								open-minded
constructive ideas								worthless ideas
impulsive								deliberate
accurate								careless
gets to point								roundabout
superficial								analytical
prompt								slow
ignores problems								solves problems

PART II. Directions: Answer in the spaces below. You may want to describe an incident to illustrate your comments.

1. WHAT CONTRIBUTES MOST TO THIS STAFF MEMBER'S JOB EFFECTIVENESS?

2. IN WHAT WAYS COULD THIS STAFF MEMBER INCREASE HIS JOB EFFECTIVENESS?

FIGURE 3. Conference Role Semantic Differential (Revised)

STAFF EVALUATION OF _____

PART I. Directions: Place an "X" on each line below, at the point which represents your judgment of this staff member.

	Very	Quite	Slightly	No Opinion	Slightly	Quite	Very	
accepting								rejecting
unapproachable								approachable
annoying								pleasant
approving								faultfinding
attentive								inattentive
closed-minded								open-minded
constructive ideas								worthless idea
impulsive								deliberate
accurate								careless
gets to point								roundabout
superficial								analytical
prompt								slow
ignores problems								solves problem
dictates								persuades
clarifies								confuses

PART II. Directions: Answer in the spaces below. You may want to describe an incident to illustrate your comments.

1. WHAT CONTRIBUTES MOST TO THIS STAFF MEMBER'S JOB EFFECTIVENESS?

2. IN WHAT WAYS COULD THIS STAFF MEMBER INCREASE HIS JOB EFFECTIVENESS?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 1. 1973 Rotated Factor Loadings for Committee Roles of Institutional Research Personnel

Factors	I. [a]	II.	III.	Communality
I. Group Maintenance				
Pulled together related ideas discussed by the group	869	130	-316	872
Listened well to contributions of others	846	-142	-195	774
Promoted good personal feelings among committee members	678	-243	148	540
Encouraged others to contribute to the discussion	640	188	399	604
Contributions were clearly stated	511	114	432	460
II. Self-Serving				
Interfered with group progress by going off on a tangent, arguing too much on a point or rejecting ideas without consideration	20	875	-144	786
Introduced or supported suggestions related to his own pet concerns or philosophies	- 9	781	-257	683
III. Task				
Introduced information or ideas which contributed to committee decisions	35	229	879	826
Was well prepared for committee meetings	- 58	- 69	593	360
Per Cent of Total Variance	22	14	14	

[a] Leading decimals have been omitted from all factor loadings

TABLE 2. 1972 Rotated Factor Loadings for Conference Roles of Institutional Research Personnel

Factors	I. [a]	II.	III.	IV.	Communality
I. Person-Task					
Deliberate--Impulsive	866	- 31	72	315	855
Analytical--Superficial	853	310	89	29	832
Approachable--Unapproachable	741	230	435	- 91	780
Attentive--Inattentive	701	161	79	- 45	525
Cooperative--Uncooperative	536	244	545	- 28	688
II. Problem-Solving					
Accurate--Careless	31	885	-113	225	847
Solves Problems--Ignores Problems	318	865	175	72	886
Constructive Ideas--Worthless Ideas	289	825	287	78	853
III. Tact in Personal Contacts					
Gets to Point--Roundabout	159	42	895	- 84	835
Pleasant--Annoying	- 23	81	714	333	629
Prompt--Slow	378	67	664	339	704
Cooperative--Uncooperative	536	244	545	28	688
IV. Accepting Others' Views					
Approving--Faultfinding	- 28	37	172	923	884
Open-Minded--Closed-Minded	119	402	27	771	771
Per Cent of Total Variance	40	16	13	9	

[a] Leading decimals have been omitted from all factor loadings

TABLE 3. 1973 Rotated Factor Loadings for Conference Roles of Institutional Research Personnel

Factors	I. [a]	II.	III.	IV.	Communality
I. Tact in Personal Contacts					
Gets to Point--Roundabout	908	90	8	140	852
Clarifies--Confuses	854	156	73	280	838
Attentive--Inattentive	851	16	86	129	748
Pleasant--Annoying	841	343	201	116	878
Analytical--Superficial	778	50	237	224	714
Prompt--Slow	530	257	345	366	600
Accurate--Careless	504	18	427	343	555
II. Accepting Others' Views					
Accepting--Rejecting	30	727	17	19	530
Approachable--Unapproachable	438	615	94	87	585
Approving--Faultfinding	80	584	90	514	619
Open-Minded--Closed-Minded	351	562	211	530	764
III. Persuasive					
Persuades--Dictates	36	361	830	16	821
Deliberate--Impulsive	443	137	740	4	762
IV. Problem-Solving					
Constructive Ideas--Worthless Ideas	100	116	163	798	686
Solves Problems--Ignores Problems	291	117	238	606	522
Per cent of Total Variance	32	13	12	13	

[a] Leading decimals have been omitted from all factor loadings

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 4. Adjective Scale-Vector Correlations and Factor Locations

Adjective Scale	r	Factor Location 1972		1973
Approachable--Unapproachable	.501	1		2
Accurate--Careless	.696	2		1
Pleasant--Annoying	.713	3		1
Constructive Ideas--Worthless Ideas	.781	2	=	4
Gets to Point--Roundabout	.793	3		1
Deliberate--Impulsive	.873	1		3
Prompt--Slow	.880	1		3
Approving--Faultfinding	.908	4	=	2
Attentive--Inattentive	.916	1	=	1
Open-Minded--Close-Minded	.922	4	=	2
Analytical--Superficial	.941	1	=	1
Solves Problems--Ignores Problems	.986	2	=	4